



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Is not the play criticized in the passage last cited for not hitting a mark at which it does not aim? Shall we call the Choruses, for example, "indefensibly artless"? I admit that they are distinctly non-dramatic. And while Dr. Furnivall's criticism is true for us, it is well to remember that the play was not made for us. That *Henry V* is not a real masterpiece, completely effective for all men and for ever, must be admitted. But this play should not be judged entirely from a dramatic standpoint. The drama was made for man, not man for the drama. The Prince who has interested us in three preceding plays is here presented as the young hero-king. Our admiration is appealed to more than our sympathy. The purpose and effect of the piece are more epic than dramatic. This epic song to the glory of England and England's hero-king, written and acted about a decade after the defeat of the Armada, undoubtedly drew crowds to the new Globe Theatre, and quickened the patriotism of every man who saw and heard it. The crowds paid well, and that also was intended. When examined in the study by a spectacled twentieth century scholar, the play easily gets out of focus. While we apply our critical measurements and standards, we easily forget the mighty communal and national appeal which brought the great throngs together, and which thrilled and satisfied them.

ALBERT H. TOLMAN.

The University of Chicago.

THE LEGEND OF THE GLOVE

In his introduction to Lope de Vega's play *El Guante de Doña Blanca*¹ Menéndez y Pelayo gives an account of the history of this motif upon which the play is partly based; it is the well-known legend of the glove, which has become famous through Schiller's ballad *Der Handschuh*. It could be summarized as follows: From motives of pride a lady induces a knight who has courted her for a long time to bring her back a glove which she had dropped into a lion's cage; the knight performs the deed, escaping unhurt, but punishes the lady by striking her in the face. The Spanish origin

¹ *Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española*, tomo ix, Madrid, 1899. *Observaciones preliminares*, pp. lxxxv-xcii.

of the legend has been known for many years.² Menéndez y Pelayo gives nine different versions as found in Spanish literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and Fr. Thiel mentions five.³ Neither of these scholars mentions another allusion contained in the fifteenth scene of the first act of Lope's play *La Portuguesa y dicha del forastero*.⁴ There Celia tries to persuade Don Félix to postpone his departure. The passage reads as follows:

Pues bien, ¡un día os altera,
Que perdéis por una dama!
¿De qué gigante, qué fuerza,
Las doncellas me librásteis?
¿Qué guante de la leonera
Habeis sacado por mí?
Qué moro muerto en la guerra!
Si hoy perdisteis la jornada,
Mañana podréis hacerla.

Thiel⁵ brings out the fact that the legend came to form the subject-matter of the thirty-ninth tale of the third part of Bandello's *Novelle*, published at Lucca in 1554,⁶ without trying to ascertain the direct source of the Italian. In his introduction to the story Bandello asserts he heard the subject from the account of a Catalan named Valenza. The indications which the author is in the habit of giving in the introductions to his stories are generally considered as untrustworthy. With the great influence the Spaniards exercised upon Italian courts after the battle of Pavia, and with a Spanish dynasty ruling over Naples, an oral source would at least not be improbable. However this may be, it is impossible to come to a definite opinion for the time being, since exceedingly little has been done to discover the sources of the Italian novelist. What we can determine are the changes the story has undergone when entering this new stage of its history. Doña Ana de Mendoza has become Leonora. The outcome is no longer

² Cf. Fr. Thiel, *Der Handschuh*, Leipzig, 1881, 82-87; Liebrecht, *Schiller, Der Handschuh, Germania*, VII (1847), 419; Adolf Laun, *Eine altspanische Romanze zur Vergleichung mit Schillers Handschuh*, *Schnorrs Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, I (1870), 507.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 77-79 and 82-87.

⁴ *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, XXXIV, 161.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 72-76.

⁶ Matteo Bandello, *Le Novelle*, a cura di Gioachino Brognoligo, Bari, Laterza, 1911, IV, 363-367.

a happy one, for the knight leaves the lady after having punished her. Lastly, the story is connected with another one, that of the seven Moors. The first two changes are obviously the work of Bandello. The reason for the second change becomes clear when we consider the general morality of Bandello's stories, which is characterized by Tiraboschi with the following words: "Prese in Boccaccio la oscenità e vi lasciò l'eleganza." As a matter of fact, with Bandello all the monastic-ascetic elements have given way before the pagan ideals of the Renaissance. The happy ending of the Spanish must have appeared disagreeable to this "jouis seur," who hardly approved of ladies imposing proofs of valor of such a doubtful character upon their lovers, without being more severely punished than was the case in the Spanish ballad. It is utterly unlikely that a version with this different outcome should have existed in Spain without leaving any trace in Spanish works. As for the third change, we must suppose Bandello to have had as a source a Spanish version in which there existed already the combination of the two adventures. A passage in the *Infierno de Amor* by Garci-Sánchez de Badajoz, quoted by Menéndez y Pelayo,⁷ as well as the verses of Lope mentioned above, make this perfectly clear.

Bandello's version of the story was copied *literally* by Francesco Sansovino and incorporated in his collection called *Cento Novelle Scelte*,⁸ where it forms the second story of the tenth day.

When and under what circumstances the legend came to Germany is not known yet. Thiel⁹ mentions several compilations containing the story, without entering upon the problem of determining the sources. The collection *Wendunmuth*¹⁰ was compiled by Hans Wilhelm Kirchhof, whose life as a "lands knecht" led him to many parts of Germany, and several times to France, where he took part in the religious wars. The sources of the work are still

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. lxxxvi-lxxxvii.

⁸ *Cento Novelle scelte* da' più nobili scrittori della lingua volgare, di Francesco Sansovino, nelle quali piacevoli e notabili avvenimenti si contengono. Di nuovo reformato, riveduto, e corretto. Venezia, A. de Vecchi, 1597.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 88-90.

¹⁰ *Wendunmuth*, von Hans Wilhelm Kirchhof, herausgegeben von Hermann Österley, Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, Tübingen, 1869, xcv, 68.

in large part unknown. Our story forms the fifty-ninth tale of the first volume. The action is practically the same, only the instigator is no longer a lady, but a German prince, the victim his knight. The outstanding feature of the story is the moral contained in the little verse at the end:

Unmöglich anmutung der herrn
Macht abscheuwliche diener gern.

We shall find a similar moralizing tendency in the French translation of Belleforest, with the only difference that the French moralist points out the ingratitude of ladies. Yet in the medieval German mind *Herrendienst* and *Frauendienst* are supposed to be about the same as far as their disadvantageous consequences for the servant are concerned. There is an old German saying testifying to this attitude:

Herrengunst, Aprilenwetter,
Frauenlieb' und Rosenblätter,
Würfel-, Karten-, Federspiel
Verändern sich oft, wer's glauben will.

Thus it would not be altogether improbable to suppose a French source, the version of Belleforest, accepting the possibility that Kirchhof converted the lady into a prince, owing to the fact that he himself seems to have had more than one occasion to complain of the ingratitude of *Herrendienst*.

In 1559 Boaisiuau, a Breton nobleman, translated twelve stories of Bandello's collection into French, giving his work the title of *Histoires tragiques*. It was continued by François de Belleforest, who translated fifty-three more stories, which he published in three volumes till 1570. The tale of Giovanni Emanuel figures as the eighteenth story of volume 4 of Belleforest's collection.¹¹ The method followed by Belleforest in his translation has been discussed in a general way by René Sturel,¹² the results of whose investigations are fully confirmed in the particular case of this story, as will be seen from the following lines. In the translation it is four times as long; while the action remains practically the

¹¹ *Histoires tragiques* extraites des œuvres italiennes du Bandel et mises en langue Française, Par François de Belle-forest, Comingeois. Tome Quatrième, A Rouen, Chez Pierre Calles, 1604.

¹² *Bandello en France au XVI^e siècle*, *Bulletin italien*, XIII (1913), 210 ff. and 331 ff., XIV (1914), 29 ff., 211 ff., 300 ff., XV (1915), 2 ff., 56 ff.

same as in the Italian original, the translator indulges in all kinds of digressions, as ridiculous in their character as they are harmful from the view-point of the artist. Here are a few examples illustrating the procedure of the French writer. Bandello contents himself with giving Seville as the scene of the action, putting it in a gerundial clause: "essendo la Corte in Seviglia." Belleforest gives a long description of the Spanish court, narrating that it had moved from "Medinne" to Seville, adding that the latter was then the capital of the Spanish kingdom, a fact highly indifferent for the understanding of the story. Then he tells that the knight had accompanied the king, not because his duty as a courtier required it, but solely for the love of his lady. When stating the fact that King Ferdinand kept some lions in a cage, he asserts that kings and men of power have generally a taste somewhat different from that of the vulgar. Thus he shows his mental superiority and greater knowledge on all possible and impossible occasions, the worst mistake a novelist can commit. But this is not all; he has changed the action as well. The scene of the knight punishing the lady, which would have been too shocking for Belleforest's society, was omitted and replaced by a tiresome discourse. Likewise, the character of Leonora is different from the Italian model. While in the latter her motive was mere frivolity, hers is a most perverse character in the French translation. She sends the knight down into the cage, hoping that the lions might rid her of him for good; for "elle l'eust voulu sçavoir en l'isle de Cuba en la nouvelle Espagne, pour n'avoir plus un si fascheux reveille-matin pour luy rompre la teste."¹³ Later, when he comes back safe and secure, she regrets that the lions had had their meal before she had sent him down. The reason of the change is obvious: Belleforest, a moralist of Puritan character, wished to inveigh against the vanity of the young courtiers of his time. This moral purpose can be seen in the very title of the story. Bandello writes: "Don Giovanni Emanuel ammazza sette mori ed entra nel serraglio dei lioni e ne esce salvo per amor di donna."¹⁴ Belleforest translates: "Un chevalier espagnol se met *follement* au hazard pour acquerir la grace d'une demoiselle, puis, recognoissant *sa folie* se depart *sagement* de sa poursuite."¹⁵ It is interesting to note that Belleforest

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 615.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 364.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 597.

as a true Frenchman tries to bring in analysis of character, where the Italian model showed nothing of that sort. When the hero, after having performed the courageous deed, mounts the steps to return to the lady, the change that is going on in his heart is described with the following words:¹⁶ "Mais montant les degrez il s'auisa de toutes ses folies passees, & des dangers où desia par deux fois il s'estoit mis & expose pour cette folle qu'il cognut lors estre plus que traistresse & malicieuse, cherchant ainsi les moyens qu'elle faisoit pour le faire mourir." Above all, Belleforest's love of long discourses and rhetoric pierces through everywhere. In order to express the fact that the knight has been cured of his love, he has recourse to Ulysses and Circe, Timon of Athens, Renaud de Montauban, Tristan and King Mark; his hero breaks forth in a long monologue, and finally writes a long poem, which he causes a friend of his to hand over to Eleonore.

Of an infinitely higher quality is the treatment of the same subject by Brantôme. Speaking Italian and Spanish with equal facility and being in favor with the Spanish and Italian courts, it may be assumed with an equal degree of probability that he got the subject from an Italian or Spanish source. As a matter of fact, Sanvisenti¹⁷ supposes the latter, while most of the other critics accept the former of the two possibilities. When comparing the version of Brantôme with Bandello's short story, we find some textual agreements, so that there can be no doubt as to the true source of Brantôme's account. The French author ascribes the heroic deed to the Chevalier de Lorge, a knight at the court of Francis I, and captain of the Scottish body-guard of the king. He was the father of the unlucky Montgomery who killed Henry II in a tournament, was persecuted by Catherine of Medicis, turned Protestant, took part in the civil wars, was taken prisoner and executed in 1574 in the presence of the court. Montgomery had two brothers, Corbozon and Lorges, who were both intimate friends of Brantôme.¹⁸ The story was inserted in the *Discours sixiesme, sur ce que les belles et honestes dames aiment les vaillants hommes, et*

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 616.

¹⁷ *Il Guanto dello Schiller, Rivista d'Italia*, 1904, I, 666.

¹⁸ Ludovic Lalanne, *Brantôme, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Société de l'Histoire de France, Paris, 1896.

les braves hommes aiment les Dames courageuses,¹⁹ with the obvious purpose of pleasing the author's friends and their family, upon whom the glory of the courageous deed of their father would naturally be reflected. Nor do we need to be astonished at the stratagems Brantôme used to disguise the fact that he was actually plundering a writer who was still living or had not been dead for many years, when the "Discours" was written, as proceedings of this sort were quite common at that time. Moreover, we cannot deny the skill he displays on this occasion as on many others. The story of the Moors has been omitted, the time is no longer that of Ferdinand and Isabel, but that of Francis I, the scene has moved from Seville to Paris, the knight Giovanni Emanuel has become the captain of the Scottish body-guard, and his merciless sweetheart is no longer Leonora, but a lady whose name Brantôme feigns to conceal for discretion's sake. Naturally, he does not say: "I found the story in Bandello's *Novelle*," but he starts with the dignified phrase: "J'ay ouy faire un conte à la Cour aux anciens d'une Dame qui estoit à la Cour, etc."²⁰

Now we have seen that about the same time Belleforest translated the story, and the question arises: Did Brantôme know of this translation? If so, did he use it? At first sight one would be inclined to give an absolutely negative answer, so great is the difference between the bombastic account of the moralist and the excellent, remodelled story of the courtier, for from the artistic viewpoint Brantôme's version is even superior to the Italian original. With a few but well-chosen words he depicts a whole situation, there is no discourse, no moralizing in his story. The rudeness of the knight in the final scene has been done away with partly, since it has been put in a clause starting with "On dit." Still, there are a few words which suggest the possibility of Brantôme's having at least known the work of Belleforest, which was widely read in court circles.

Brantôme's account is generally considered as the source of Saint-Foix, who in his turn suggested the subject to Schiller. This is the place to mention the error Sanvisenti commits²¹ in supposing that Schiller could not have found anything else in Saint-

¹⁹ *Œuvres complètes de Pierre de Bourdeille seigneur de Brantôme*, publiées par Ludovic Lalanne, Paris, Renouard, 1876, ix, 390.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 390.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 666.

Foix, except the anecdote of Pippin the Short, and that Brantôme's version must, therefore, be considered as the direct source of the German poet. There is no need for such a theory, since the account of Brantôme, somewhat abridged, is found in Saint-Foix's *Essais historiques sur Paris*.²²

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

The University of Chicago.

THE SOCIAL SATIRES OF THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK

PART II

Peacock stands aloof from all political alignment. Condemning as he did the society of his day, he obviously could have been neither a conservative Tory nor even a moderate Whig. One might, therefore, suppose him a radical, like his friend Shelley; but the facts contradict such a hypothesis. In 1819, when his career as a satirist was just under way, he accepted a post in the India House. In the first place, if he were a radical, he could scarcely have taken a semi-government position without all his radical friends making at least private remonstrance against this apostasy—especially as they made such an ado over the “apostasy” of Southey and Wordsworth. In the case of Peacock, nothing of the sort happened; Shelley, in fact, writes congratulating him on being so well provided for (Ingpen, pp. 697 and 710). Had Peacock ever been a radical, Shelley certainly could not have voiced such sentiments. In the second place, Peacock, at this time and afterwards, continues to attack the “lakers” for their apostasy—a thing he would scarcely have had the face to do, had he but lately played apostasy in exactly the same fashion to exactly the same cause. Peacock, then, had never been a radical, and indeed never became one. He represents them in a light at once antipathetic and ludicrous: insincere faddists, they all cry each his own panacea, recommending to society a nostrum whose efficacy the vendor himself has never tested. Then finally came the Reform Bill of 1832, which Peacock considered bootless, a fitting summary to his opinion of reforms and reformers. In short, after looking about him and seeing society corrupt, he turned his eyes to the intellectual life that was moulding the

²² *Œuvres complètes de M. de Saint-Foix*, Paris, Duchesne, 1778, III, 183 ff